**Day 2 responses - NWIC**

**Focused time and space for collaboration (purposeful, inclusive, consistent over time, with protocols) – working together towards goals (of student learning and engagement)**

To the extent that this has been effective for us it is because the full-time, main campus faculty have actively sought other stakeholders out (GED instructor, tutors, site-based and part-time faculty), invited them to join the conversation, deliberately soliciting each individual’s input (possible because we are a relatively small group), and put everyone on a formally equal footing in terms of decision-making; funding was essential given the long distances that separate our faculty; but there is still more to do.

**Faculty-driven (and informed) data-gathering and evidence-based decisions**

We have gathered some data for ourselves, and we found this to be valuable because it helps us present a picture of what we are doing to the administrators.

We haven’t made such significant structural decisions about curriculum based on evidence of student achievement; but we have practiced looking at evidence from student work, and we can foresee a time when we will have to make more hard decisions (about the curriculum about of the lowest-level class) and we have had SOME practice making collective decisions based on a process of gathering data of teacher practice, as opposed to student achievement.

**Ongoing professional learning opportunities that honors professional judgment of faculty**

This was definitely an element for us; we sought out the curriculum development by Ruth Parker, we liked it, sought out more of it and then embedded it (increasingly so) in our classes. PD opportunities offered by administration without faculty input are a mixed bag of useless and suffer from miscommunication.

**Trusting environment with increased transparency and clarity in communication regarding learning students’ processes and results**

We needed to create this environment to be open to doing classroom observations and sharing students work that might not reflect well on classroom learning; we set up a practice of watching a video found on youtube of a teacher from another institution, and practicing using a protocol that everyone agreed on and later participated in amending. We have not been completely successful.

**Culture of improvement and innovation open to making mistakes and learning from them**

Could this be folded into the previous one? The discussion about openness to making mistakes is part of the beginning of the conversation about improvement;

**Giving administrators a real window to the work (concrete evidence) – building relationships, open and explicit communications**

There was initial buy-in from our Dean who participated in many of the meetings; so he understands the broad idea, but he (and other administrators) have not necessarily witnessed the classrooms; or FIG meetings; this has not necessarily hindered our work. Clear communication with key administrators IS important, and to some extent the lack of doing so has hindered us.